

WED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

Brief Opposing Plaintiff's Motion for Extension

HANNAH GITTINGS;
CHRISTOPHER MCNEAL;
NATHAN PEET; and
CARMEN PALMER,


Plaintiffs,

v.

KEVIN MATHEWSON, in his individual capacity;
KENOSHA GUARD;
RYAN BALCH, in his individual capacity;
BOOGALOO BOIS;
KYLE RITTENHOUSE, in his individual capacity;
FACEBOOK, Inc., a U.S. Corporation,

Defendants.

Civil Case No. 2:20-CV-01483 WED



I, Kevin Mathewson appearing pro-se specially and with the sole purpose of informing this court that it this defendant opposes the plaintiff's motion for extension of time. The 90-day threshold had already been exhausted by the time the plaintiffs filed the motion to extend time. It is highly likely that Attorney Flores-William's own incompetence is the reason for missing the deadline and not any other reason. It appears Attorney Flores-Williams did not know about the 90-day rule and was only made aware by this defendant's motion to dismiss. If this court grants my motion to dismiss and plaintiffs wish to re-file, that is their prerogative. This court needs to hold Flores-Williams accountable for his inexperience and ignorance of Federal Court procedures. The plaintiff's motion for an extension for time to serve doesn't mention any plausible explanation for missing the deadline. Mailing pleadings via USPS does not take 90 days and a request for a 60-day extension is laughable at best. I respectfully request this court dismiss this complaint and deny plaintiff's request for an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Mathewson".

Kevin Mathewson